

ational Front should not use the town hall

No. 81 March 1975

Spearhead

15p

left victory

Shock for Front: rally is banned!

as riot

Stop them now!

Leader's decision over-ruled

UPROAR AS NF RALLY IS

leader
week by withdraw-
g the permission
gave for the
ational Front to
the town hall.

NOW BANNED

n bans
all-Labour Isms
after all not to give
national political platf

Labour councils' policy:

SMASH FREE SPEECH!

Nationalist comment

WHAT WE THINK

on the month's news

Fur-hatted slapstick

Among the many dwarfish figures that have occupied the British Premiership during the 20th Century a common gimmick has established itself. This is the well known and frequent diplomatic visit to foreign parts.

Prime Ministers of both Conservative and Labour, once the barrenness of their achievement at home has become apparent to everyone including themselves, have sought to inflate their shrivelled stature by strutting and posturing in the reception halls of foreign capitals. Then they have arrived back in Britain flourishing bits of paper which they claim represent the signing and sealing of some momentous and historical step forward in the affairs of the world. Everyone is expected to forget their failures to put Britain on its feet and think only of their services as international statesmen.

As it was with MacDonald and

Chamberlain in the '20s and '30s, so it has been with McMillan, Heath and Wilson in the '60s and '70s. Dear Harold W. has in fact become almost an itinerant messenger boy in his global wanderings, popping up like a jack-in-the-box in Washington one moment and Moscow the next.

In their newspapers on a damp February morning this year the British public were treated to photographs of their Head of Government standing on the tarmac of Moscow airport with a Cossack-style hat about three sizes too big for him resting on his head at an angle usually reserved for music hall comedians. Surrounding him were numerous Kremlin officials whose probable expressions of contempt were not quite clear enough to come out in the picture.

Harold then proceeded to make speeches of drooling sycophancy towards the Soviet Union, saying how impressed he was with its living standards and paying tribute to it "for the statesmanship of its contribution to detente".

The sheer unreality behind such talk must surely have drawn gasps from anyone acquainted with the actual deeds and purposes of Soviet policy in the world. Right now Russia is supplying arms to a subversive movement within Britain's borders dedicated to the annexation of a part of the United Kingdom by a foreign power, and these arms are being used to kill and mutilate innocent British citizens. Right now Russia is plotting and organising the disruption of British industry through its many agents active in British trade unions. Right now Russia has a massive spy network extending throughout the length and breadth of our country. Right now Russia has a huge navy patrolling the oceans of the world which cannot possibly be justified in terms of any role required for the security of the Soviet Union itself, and

added to this navy is a merchant fleet whose ships can frequently be seen off the shores of the British Isles keeping the tabs on our installations with unending diligence.

And here, against the background of all this, is Harold in Moscow engaging in a mutual back-slapping orgy with Brezhnev and Co., then returning puffed up with pride because he has received an undertaking from the red leaders that they will buy a few more goods from Britain than in the past a mission which, even were the undertaking received worth anything, could easily have been performed by a relatively minor official of the Board of Trade.

Deeply and humiliatingly has Britannia fallen in this year of 1975!

Heah! Heah!

Some of our readers will perhaps remember a satirical gramophone record made by Peter Sellers some years ago of which one feature was a political speech in which the speaker orated for several minutes without uttering one meaningful word.

One was reminded of this last month when reading the reports of the various contenders for the Tory leadership presenting their credentials to the faithful of the party. For the art of platitude it is indeed difficult to know whether to present the first prize to Margaret Thatcher, William Whitelaw or James Prior.

Willie Whitelaw's claims are undoubtedly strong, as is indicated by this passage:—

"Our principle must be to resist wrongful changes. We need new idealism. A new slogan will follow, although I don't yet pretend to know what that slogan will be."

Just to affirm that this wasn't all he had to say, Mr. Whitelaw added that the Tories must "stand up for what was best in British society".

Not to be outdone, Mrs. Thatcher stated: "We should encourage the workers and not the shirkers."

"Those who prospered," she said, "had a duty and responsibility to care for others. That responsibility did not stop at home but extended to the community of which we were all part."

Doubtless, all of us would do well to ponder on the thought that we not only have a duty to care for others but also that we have a responsibility to do so.

Mr. Prior's contribution to the debate was none the less inspiring just as his words were none the less penetrating. "It is a time-honoured Conservative principle," he wrote in an open letter to a colleague, "to stand up for the individual."

And on the economic situation, "When we look at the immediate practical difficulties of industry and the economy which stand in our path, I can only say that we have to establish a new form of consent between management, unions and government."

S P E A R H E A D

No. 82 MARCH 1975

Office: 50 Pawsons Road, Croydon, CRO 2QF, Surrey (Tel. 01-684 3730)

Editor: John Tyndall Asst. Editor: Martin Webster

Spearhead exists to reflect a cross-section of contemporary British nationalist opinion. It is privately published by its Editor and is independent of all political parties and groups.

Unless specifically stated to the contrary, the views expressed in signed articles or letters are the sole responsibility of their authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Editor or the policies of any political organisation *Spearhead* may support editorially.

The appearance of an advertisement in *Spearhead* is not necessarily indicative that the Editor has any knowledge of, interest in or support for the product, service, organisation or function advertised.

Spearhead welcomes enquiries from potential advertisers, to whom rates will be sent on request. Advertising matter, accompanied by pre-payment, must be submitted at least one month prior to the publishing date (normally the first day of each month) of the issue for which the advertisement is intended. The Editor reserves the right to refuse to publish advertisements submitted.

The Editor is pleased to receive from readers manuscripts of articles for possible publication which should normally be not longer than 1,250 words and typed in double-spacing. No payment is made for articles published, which become *Spearhead* copyright unless authors specifically request otherwise at the time they submit their manuscripts. The Editor reserves the right to shorten or otherwise amend articles accepted for publication should shortage of space or editorial judgment require such alteration to be made.

Those wishing to re-print *Spearhead* articles must first gain the permission of the Editor and undertake to include with the re-printed matter the author's name and the name and address of *Spearhead*.

When asked how the policies they stood for differed from those of Mr. Heath all these contenders replied to the effect that what they stood for was not so much a difference of policies as perhaps a difference in style.

A reminder to us, no doubt, that if things don't change they'll stay as they are.

An integrater speaks

One or two readers have written to us protesting about Andrew Coniam's article in the January issue, which criticised the organisation of General Walker. These and others might be interested to know of a letter which was sent to one reader, Mr. G. H. Smith of Canterbury, by Lt. Col. Robert Butler, who is General Walker's chief assistant.

Asked by Mr. Smith to define his attitude towards immigration, Col. Butler said that he was not in favour of it but that:

"Immigrants already in this country who wish to remain should be allowed to integrate as quickly as possible and to learn our language."

Col. Butler lives at Sway, near Lymington in Hampshire, not an area renowned for its massive concentration of immigrant peoples.

Andrew Coniam's views expressed in his article were his own. However, in the general substance of what he said there is nothing from which, editorially, we would seek to differ. We believe that the type of organisations set up by General Walker and Colonel Stirling are a complete waste of time so far as any serious patriots in this country are concerned. They are intended only as a means of preserving the very establishment whose failures and ineptitude have done more to undermine the welfare of this country than any of the Communist agitators whom they attack.

We are sorry if a few of our readers disagree with us, and we hope that they will change their minds in the course of time.

Anti-Royalist rubbish

No greater nonsense could have been spoken than that heard last month from left-wing Labour MPs protesting about the proposed increase of £420,000 in the Queen's allowance.

When we contribute money to the maintenance of the Monarchy we are not doing a favour to the Royal Family as individuals; we are assisting them in the maintenance of a national institution which the great majority in this country wish to see maintained. This institution does not provide an easy life for Royal Family members; quite the contrary, it puts a considerable strain on them which, were they to think only of themselves, they would no doubt in many

cases be glad to relinquish.

These constant knockers of Royalty belong to two main categories. One wishes to see Britain become a republic — an event which would bring no benefit in the slightest to this country and which at the same time would take away one of the few remaining bases upon which a renewal of links with Britons elsewhere in the world might one day be made possible. The other category wants to see Royalty preserved in a form which would bring it down to the same cheap and colourless level of the average Westminster MP, without grandeur, without palaces, without the Trooping of the Colour, without any elevated mystique whatever — perfectly in tune with the mentality of the modern day left-wing progressive thinker, who craves a Mini-Monarchy as an apt symbol of Mini-Britain.

Good for Israel!

"Jews living in Western countries are facing the real test of their solidarity with Israel and must be ready for open conflicts with their home governments over the Middle East crisis." These were the words of Dr. Nahum Goldmann, president of the World Jewish Congress, speaking at an assembly of the Congress on February 3rd.

The first duty of Jews in the diaspora (Jews dispersed all over the world) was to Israel, Dr. Goldmann said emphatically. "If there were a serious conflict of loyalties, such as war between Israel and another country with Jewish citizens, each person would have to determine his priorities. Jews abroad had the right to be loyal to Israel, and, if properly explained, this would be understood by all decent non-Jews."

Taking these words on their own, we can only feel admiration and respect for Israel, for the Jews and for Dr. Goldmann.

It is when we take them in a particular context, in fact the context that corresponds to present day reality, that they must be open to question.

The question simply is this: do not Dr. Goldmann and those who support him believe passionately and even militantly that all Jews living outside Israel should have absolutely equal rights with the other citizens of the countries in which they reside?

We are sure that this is what they do believe, and indeed every spokesman both for and in favour of the Jews has said as much whenever the matter of such rights are raised. In fact it is the allegation that Jews are being denied equal rights in the Soviet Union right now that has led to so much fury on the part of Jews and pro-Jews everywhere.

But surely rights and duties have a definite relationship to each other. Is it fair to claim that citizens of a country should have equal rights to all other citizens

of that country when in fact they are not expected to accept equal duties?

And it is quite clear from what Dr. Goldmann proposes that he does not see Jews as having equal duties to such other citizens. In the event of a clash of interests between a particular country and the State of Israel Jews in that country are expected to owe first duty towards Israel and not to the country of their residence.

Is there any other race in the world for whom this peculiarly favourable balance of duties and rights is advocated? None that we are aware of.

As we have said earlier, this essentially nationalistic and indeed racist, loyalty to kith and kin beyond territorial boundaries is something for which the Jews should be admired. Why indeed should not a Jew put Israel first?

At the same time we must ask: Why indeed should the government of a gentile country in which Jews reside not recognise a loyalty and duty towards its indigenous gentile citizens which is greater than that towards its Jewish guest residents?

No doubt, as has happened before, one or two of our readers will write to us now and accuse us of venturing into the dark and muddy waters of 'anti-semitism'. But in fact we are doing nothing of the kind. We are proposing the very opposite of anti-semitism — that there should be no difference between the way Jews are treated and the way that they would treat others.

Now - "Euroways"!

"Euro-ways" are apparently the latest insanity to be dreamed up by the Common Market bureaucracy.

In case the reader does not know what a "Euro-way" is, it is a motorway classified within a European, as distinct from a national, network. It is hoped, for instance, to have one great Euro-way extending from Shannon to Moscow. The genius who thought this one up no doubt envisages another Euro-way stretching from Hammerfest to Palermo — although perhaps a natural sense of proportion inhibits him from announcing it at this stage.

Of course, to ask the question: how many people want to get from Shannon to Moscow would be to completely misunderstand the spirit behind the Euro-way project. Such a consideration pales into insignificance beside the grand symbolic nature of the concept. Just think of it — what greater way of encouraging Paddy O'Leary to rejoice in his common European citizenship with Ivan Ivanovich?

It is not yet made quite clear to what extent this Euro-way programme involves the building of new roads and to what extent it means simply adding to the multiplicity of signs on existing roads. Whatever the answer is, we can be sure that the painters all over Europe are going to be very busy.

THE LESSON FROM PORTUGAL

IT would have been hard a year ago to imagine that the entire government system in Portugal might be overthrown. Yet overthrown it has been, and moreover by that most trusted of institutions, the army. On closer scrutiny though, a familiar pattern of intrigue emerges that falls into line with the schemes of internationalism.

First, however, let me declare it to be my intention neither to glorify the former Salazar/Caetano regime nor to excuse its fundamental mistakes of policy. Rather I seek to analyse how the latent weakness of Portugal has been manipulated by the communists.

Anyone who has watched the B.B.C. TV series 'The Unsettled Peace' about the cold war will notice parallels between Soviet occupied Eastern Europe in the late '40s and Portugal today.

In each case, from anarchy and a political vacuum created by the total downfall of a monolithic dictatorship it was that hydra-headed monster the Communist party that was first to arise. From well organised underground cells the Communists had a head start on all other political parties, which were in any case themselves infiltrated by the Communists. Added to this, in both Czechoslovakia (1948) and Portugal (1974) the armed forces had been infiltrated at a high level. Predictably, it was the Lisbon-based units which staged the April coup and it appears that at least some of the men leading it were Marxist staff-officers rather than the more traditionally minded combatant officers who were mostly involved overseas in the war zones.

Significant, too, the Navy had become the most Marxist-orientated of the three services. Unlike the Air force and the Army, it had played very little part in the counter-terrorist activity. Staff positions in Naval and Army administration at Lisbon were being filled by frustrated, underpaid radicals, often university graduates and frequently with communist leanings. They were the ones who instigated the coup (see ref. at end) through their Armed Forces Movement and installed a junta with General Spínola at its head. The junta itself was probably not Marxist in its initial form but, despite the leadership of General Spínola, unquestionably an enemy of Communism, it was manipulated by Marxists. Its members had no political experience and were unable to cope with the demands of the people who saw in

their newly acquired freedom an opportunity to instantly obtain a 'Northern European' standard of living.

Strikes, soaring inflation, demands to withdraw the youth of Portugal from a seemingly endless series of wars in Africa all helped to create a situation which would only be rectified by the introduction of Socialists and Communists into the government. This was done, and there occurred the paradox of a Communist minister 'successfully' persuading striking workers to return to their jobs and to moderate their demands. Irresponsible Marxists and Trotskyists were blamed for the chaos, but the extent to which this chaos was engineered by the Communists themselves has yet to be revealed. Anyhow, the object of the exercise was achieved, and the Portuguese Communist Party was seen by public opinion to have averted a crisis. Such is the Machivellian nature of their intrigue!

DOUBLY REPUGNANT

At the time of writing the Communist Party looks set to triumph over its hopelessly disunited opposition. To me the thought of this happening is doubly repugnant, for Portugal is a beautiful land, possibly the most beautiful and colourful country that I have ever visited. Its people, I found, were courteous, charming and deeply religious. Unfortunately, they were also politically servile and ignorant, so that the total eradication of the Caetano regime has created a vacuum which the Communists have been only too willing to fill.

I was in Portugal in 1970, and have many fond memories. I can't altogether deny that I suspected that a radical change would have occurred sometime, but I never anticipated the scale and magnitude of the revolution. Nor, watching the afternoon sun sinking toward the sea from the magnificent cliffs of Cape St. Vincent, could I have imagined that the intense pride in Portugal's maritime (and hence imperial) tradition would have been ignobly rejected. Yet it is in this maritime history that one may find the reason for many of today's problems.

During the 16th century Portugal had two geographically separate overseas empires. First there was Brazil, a land colonised and developed in a big way with a plantation economy which attracted settlers from

Europe and imported slaves from Africa. Sailing ships could reach Brazil relatively easily by following the trade winds. They returned to Lisbon by the North Atlantic westerlies. Second there was the 'Estado da Índia', the oriental trading empire whose strength lay in a virtual monopoly of inter-continental shipping by the Portuguese caravels, which sailed unhindered until the Dutch came on the scene a century later. Its territorial extent was limited to a mere six or seven entrepôt ports such as Nova Goa or Macao. To sustain this trade with the east, colonies were also planted on the coasts of West and East Africa. They were isolated settlements in what are now Angola and Mozambique and served merely to provide seafarers with fresh food and repair facilities for their ships. The nature of wind and tide and the sheer distance precluded large scale settlement.

Instead, most colonists went to Brazil so that when, in the 17th and 18th centuries, the Portuguese were supplanted by British, French and Dutch mariners in the East, Portuguese Africa became a neglected backwater. Even so, following the European 'grab for Africa' in the 1880s, Portuguese suzerainty was acknowledged over what now comprise Angola and Mozambique territories. Portugal itself, however, was ill-fitted for the task of colonial rule. Left behind by the industrial revolution, which hardly touched her, not yet recovered from a series of dynastic wars, and in the throes of economic disaster following the destruction of the Port vineyards by a fungus disease, the nation was also cursed with inefficient government and still a sizeable annual emigration of her most virile people to Brazil, despite Brazil having achieved independence in the 1820s.

Some attempt at settling Angola was made in the 1890s, when Britain successfully established the protectorate of Northern Rhodesia between the two Portuguese African territories, but soon the momentum declined and little changed until the 1960s when the terrorist campaigns began.

WHITE SETTLEMENT

Hindsight tells us that Portugal should have embarked upon a vigorous policy of White settlement in Africa much earlier. That way would have produced a native born European majority which would have held Angola at least in the permanent Western fold. Alas, North and South America, and more recently France and Germany, have proved a more popular goal for Portugal's emigrants. Dr. Salazar's regime turned to multi-racialism to maintain the position in Africa. Official policy decreed that race and colour were irrelevant and that all culturally assimilated inhabitants of overseas territories were Portuguese. To facilitate integration, intermarriage was encouraged between Portuguese settlers and native

women. This was the great 'Christianising Mission' and of course tribal identities amongst the blacks had to be eliminated.

History, however, tells us that despite the removing of tribal loyalties and the teaching of black people a European life-style, religion and language never creates Black Europeans. Instead, Black Power emerges! And black power is an infinitely greater threat to the White race than is African tribalism. The United States and South Africa have both discovered this and I believe that the British nation will soon become aware of the reality of black power in our midst. My only hope is that we in Britain wake up to what is happening before we are taken over by the blacks.

In conclusion, it would seem that Portugal, by her lack of foresight and her dedication of the centuries to integration and a multi-racial society, has brought about her own downfall. Of course, the Soviet Russians have been at the back of the conspiracy, and so too have the Chinese. They instigated the revolution both in Africa and metropolitan Portugal, and supplied arms, money and training to the rebels. Ultimately, the whole aim is to undermine South Africa, which is a pivot of Western economic and defence systems, and thus rates highly on the list of targets for subversion. Portugal may fall, but I believe South Africa has the strength and willpower to survive.

Reference:

Portugal, Les Nouveaux Centurion, by Audibert and Brignon, Belfond-Paris.

MARTIN WEBSTER

Immigrant pupils + red teachers = school chaos

A REPORT has recently been issued by a Government appointed committee, Chaired by historian Sir Alan Bullock, called *A Language for Life*. (H.M.S.O. £5) The report comprises the conclusions of the committee on the subject of the standard of literacy achieved in British schools.

Study of the press reviews of the committee's report — even sympathetic ones, such as that published in *The Guardian* on 19th February — indicate that it contains a fundamental contradiction which inevitably casts serious doubt on the intentions and competence of those who prepared it.

Any parent with a child attending school with a high proportion of Coloured Immigrant pupils knows quite well that the demands which the Immigrant children make on the staff from the purely educational point of view, plus the discipline problem which they tend to exacerbate, have the effect of holding back the educational development of their child.

This fact is well known not just to parents whose children are at such schools,

but also to teachers and education authorities responsible for such schools. The problem is so bad in the Inner London Education Authority area that the turnover of staff in many schools is as rapid as that of a motorway cafe. In the Borough of Newham, where now more coloured children are born than white, the rate of teacher truancy almost matches that of the pupils!

These problems affect perhaps thousands of inner-city schools, yet the main conclusion of the Bullock committee's report is:

NO EVIDENCE?

"There is no convincing evidence available as to whether or not standards of written and spoken English have fallen."

In contradiction to this comforting assertion is another far more significant observation:

"The indications are that there may be a growing proportion of poor readers among those children of unskilled and semi-skilled workers. Moreover, the national averages almost certainly mask falling reading standards in areas with severe social and educational problems."

As tactful a way of making reference to the disastrous impact of Coloured Immigration on educational standards in the inner parts of our big cities as I have yet to read!

In view of this admission, while I did not expect the committee to observe that Coloured Immigration has had an appalling effect on our educational system and that it should be stopped and Immigrants plus their offspring returned to their lands of origin, it would have been reasonable for it to recommend that Immigrant children attend separate schools whereby their particular needs could be catered for. Needless to say no such recommendation was made!

MODERN METHODS

Immigration is not, of course, the sole cause of declining standards of education in our schools. Many modern teaching methods have shown themselves to be ineffective. "Self expression" is all very well. "Creativity" is very wonderful, I have no doubt.

THOUGHT FOR THE MONTH

Somewhere in mythology a great serpent is said to encircle the world, grasping its tail in its mouth. It is an apt symbol of the relation between Communism and Liberalism, indicating the union of these two apparent extremes as they function as parts of one evil spirit.

Communism's primary need for its world-wide attack on conservative institutions is political freedom for its activity; freedom of movement for its agents, and freedom of language for their subversive propaganda.

To gain these it dresses its wolves in Liberal clothing to preach the sanctity of human rights and democracy. It is natural that they should be in the forefront of any protest against a restriction of those freedoms, regardless of public order and safety; and they will be the first to raise an outcry of Fascism or Nazism, because they have never forgotten that but for these methods of civil regimentation Communism would have overwhelmed Germany and Italy in the 1920's, and Spain in the 1930's.

But even more dangerous than activity in the guise of Liberalism is the activity of those sincere and courageous, but unbalanced, devotees of Liberalism as a policy of absolute political virtue. They are the pathetic victims of that Humanism which champions the underdog on principle, regardless of why he is the underdog and whether if he were topdog he would be the worst tyrant of all.

Behind a banner of Human Rights they will righteously suffer the pain of unlimited foolishness, somehow conceiving that rights can exist in a vacuum, without reciprocal duties, and above the plane of circumstance. They have never studied the ways of Communism, and really believe that a congress of democrats must be what it professes to be, and that any form of detention without trial is an iniquity irrespective of any urgent service to the safety of the public. They may well be women, and university students without experience of anything but sport and protest processions, or even people of greater intellectual distinction who lack a sense of practical perspective.

It is their blind but feverish Liberalism that is most valued by the technicians of Communist subversion, and is most avidly grasped in the jaws of the great snake.

P. W. James (in letter to *South African Observer*)

Contd. on page 18

AS USUAL, one of the first acts of the Labour Government was to cut our already inadequate defences. We have had so many defence cuts in the last ten years that the public appears resigned to this country trading its armour for the Emperor's clothes. In Parliament the idea of defending Britain for reasons of patriotism seemed far too reactionary for most of the Opposition, who criticised the cuts on the grounds that the reductions would make it difficult to fulfil our obligations to NATO!

NATO may be of use to Britain, but our alliances should be judged in the long term interest of the country, not by idealism.

The cuts are wide ranging and deep. They amputate most of our strength outside Europe and hamstring the Navy. One commitment which has escaped the knife is our land force in Germany. In future our defence area will be the territory of the Common Market. Some hail this as an inevitable withdrawal from Empire. One wonders if the "defence strategy" is based on the interests of Britain or a desire to please you-know-who!

The official excuses are predictable. Firstly, we are told we must save money to spend on extra welfare, nationalization etc. Secondly we are to spend a similar percentage of our Gross National Product on defence as some of our European allies (this ignores the fact that Germany spends more on defence even though it is a smaller percentage of her G.N.P.). These allies are the weakest members of NATO. France and the U.S.A. also spend more. The official reasoning is therefore to level down to the standards of Norway or Italy. Even to look at Russians levels of defence spending would argue an increase. However, this is playing with figures. The level of defence spending in this dangerously well armed world is that which gives us an adequate level of security.

SUPPLY ROUTES UNDEFENDED

The third and worst feature of the defence cuts is the decision to leave virtually undefended the routes to our sources of supply and to our Commonwealth kin. However, before we pull out of the Mediterranean we must obtain the permission of our allies! The predictable excuse was uttered by the Minister of Defence. Mr. Mason, who said "although we trade with the world we cannot police it." He has of course missed the point. Protection of trade and policing are two different things. Most of our imports come by sea and most of our vital raw materials come from outside Europe. Disruption of these imports nearly caused our defeat in two World Wars. We all know about the modern oil blockade. The arteries of our supply are vulnerable and can only be defended by air and sea power.

There is a whole alternative strategy to that of the Establishment. It is a viable and

IAN STEVENSON

NEW THINKING ON DEFENCE



RED ARMY ON PARADE
Striking force or decoy?

probably more relevant strategy. It has nothing to do with imperial romanticism or the desire to be a world policeman.

Soon after 1945 the Establishment assumed that the main threat to these islands lay in the invasion of our end of the continent by Russia and its allies. To meet this threat we stationed almost a third of our army in Germany. It was considered better to fight in someone else's backyard than in one's own. In addition, if the Russians were held in Germany this country would be out of range of their fighter cover, although not their bombers. Overall it was and is considered a bad thing to let the Continent fall. NATO was instituted to deal with this threat, but as the Continent re-armed without enthusiasm (France excepted) it is outnumbered in men, tanks and aircraft. To meet this threat we are urged to build up European defences.

While we cannot view the Warsaw Pact without considerable caution, certain conclusions seem fairly obvious. War in Europe involves too many risks for the Soviet Union. There are the dangers of nuclear war escalating out of control. There are the dangers of winning. Victory would mean holding down two hundred and fifty million West Europeans in addition to the hundred million of Eastern Europe as well as continuing to contain their own population. It would entail stationing huge numbers of young

Russians abroad where they would be exposed to all the temptations of the West. The Soviet Union goes to considerable lengths to reduce these temptations! During any major war in Europe the Warsaw Pact allies would probably view the backs of Russians as possible targets with more enthusiasm than the fronts of German, American and British soldiers.

Britain contributes to European defence three understrength divisions. This is a heavy strain on our manpower and balance of payments. This number could not be increased (except for short emergencies) without conscription. Yet even to double the British contribution **would not make up for the deficiency in Continental troops.** The countries across the channel have over the past decade consistently cut reserves, periods of conscription and general force levels. One might also add that some of the armies are politically suspect. Communist voters make up about a quarter of the French and Italian electorates. Communists are more usually found among the young — a third or even forty percent of conscripts could be Communist voters, although patriotism would overcome politics in some cases.

If we cannot add usefully to what is a less likely threat we would do much better build up our maritime forces.

The threat of the Red Army hanging

like the sword of Damocles over Europe encourages the Europeans to withdraw to their own continent, thus giving a free hand to revolutionary forces, like Frelimo, who are often manipulated by international interests only some of which are directed by Moscow. Other sinister forces are also working against our interests.

NOT JUST MILITARY

We are facing increasing attack from within the United Kingdom and upon our sources of supply. The response must not of course be just military. Our strategy must integrate propaganda, economic power and military aid to friendly governments.

Mao Tse Tung has prophesied that the poor rural countries of the Third World will surround and defeat the rich urban countries of North America and Europe (they will contribute to their own downfall). Whether or not it is Communism that orchestrates them we cannot afford to abandon the world stage. At home we face the twin forces of left-wing agitation and the grey clad power of high finance. If we could be seen to be resisting the hegemony of Wall Street and its European agents we would win the respect of many individuals in the Third World who are seeking to build a real sovereignty for their nations. Our enemies (for that is what they are) also have enemies in these areas, for example some of the Arab monarchs.

Expense and political considerations will probably prevent "Suez" type operations to protect our investments. Equally, we are unlikely to face more than a localised confrontation with the Russian Navy. However, we are increasingly likely to face modern weaponry transferred to Third World forces, possibly manned by "volunteers" (a more and more common practice). Even if we lose some sources of supply there are others on which we can depend (with a bit of luck) such as the Old Commonwealth. The shipping will still need protection.

It should be primary aim of foreign policy to develop the links between this country and the Old Commonwealth. Collectively we could form a more independent and self-sufficient block. If, however, they believe blood is thinner than water it will make no fundamental difference to our strategy.

There is not space in this article to even outline the necessary hardware and deployment of the forces, although we would certainly need the use of the Simons-town base in South Africa, a base casually discarded to please the Left-Wing. The hardware will not be cheap. To pay for it we will probably have to reduce less essential commitments such as the army in Germany. We are a maritime nation and forget it at our peril.

NEIL FARNELL (T.G.W.U.)

WORKERS AGAINST IMMIGRATION

This is the second part of a two-part article. The writer is Secretary and Publicity Officer of the National Front Industrial Section.

THREAT TO WORKERS' STANDARDS

Apart from having a depressing affect on wages and undermining the basic social structure in a factory, the immigrants' personal behaviour and habits frequently cause racial discord on the assembly line and shop floor. In particular the Indian and Pakistani's lack of facility with English and their lack of Western hygiene do not recommend them to British workers. Sometimes language difficulties lead to preferential treatment; i.e. special training, where a simple explanation would suffice for a British worker. Some Asians cannot even understand basic safety instructions and frequently cause injury to themselves and others through this. In many cases a bi-lingual 'go between' is needed. The communication problem is also a reason why many immigrants are unsuitable for skilled work. Some factories are even at the ludicrous stage of using sign language when instructing immigrants. If immigrants do anything wrong with machinery, they often cunningly avoid responsibility by simply stating, "Me no understandee." And if they want to abuse anyone they revert back to their own language, and white workers cannot argue with them. Because of the language problem in some factories up to 50 per cent of the employees do not understand the trade union official when he is talking to them. But it is the supervision of Asians which causes the most difficulty, because they require far more attention than white workers and some cannot maintain even an elementary level of performance without constant supervision. Another factor causing white resentment are the privileges demanded by Asian immigrants because of their religion. Sikh and Muslim temples springing up all over Britain reflect the demands of Asians for new definitions of religious holidays and customs. The Muslim festivals of Ramadhan, Eid-UL-Fitr, Eid-UL-Adha and the Hindu ones of Holi, Dussehra, and Diwalir clash with employment and lead to requests for time off which British workers do not receive. There have been cases where Asians have downed tools and walked out of factories for their religious festivals — and got away

with it. Muslims, who pray five times a day, often demand space in the canteen or a room for their mid-day prayers. Sikhs also insist on wearing their turbans, even in jobs where employees wear a standard uniform with a peaked cap (such as in the transport service) or safety helmet. This leads to natural indignation among British workers who see immigrants enjoying privilege status. Union officials often complain of the lack of compromise and of unyielding demands made by Indian workers; who are backed by their powerful Indian Workers Association (Hindustani Mazdoor Sabha). But white workers who dare to speak out about immigrant arrogance are hysterically accused of being "prejudiced". With regard to "prejudice", one shop steward commented, "It's not a matter of colour — it's their way of life. They're different. They've got different habits, different religion, different hygiene." And it is the last point that British workers find the most repugnant. According to one personnel officer interviewed by a race relations researcher, the white workers in the factory were mainly against the Asian immigrant workers because of their sanitary habits, and considered this a major health hazard. The Asian's lack of hygiene is notorious throughout British industry; but despite numerous complaints by white workers little is done, and most firms refuse to provide separate facilities. Though British workers are forced into contact with immigrants while working, most understandably separate from them at break-times. In more than one factory a race survey showed that whereas the British workers ate in the canteen, the Pakistanis remained on the shop floor and ate their curry and chapatis out of pans. Many white workers think it deplorable that women employees should be subject to such obnoxious displays of alien habits. Often Asians live more than a dozen in one house and simply swop beds and clothes when changing shifts. The more articulate ones tend to exploit their fellow Asians by owning the house and charging extortionate rent. They also take positions as 'go betweens' and shop stewards, which gives them all power over Asians with a poor command of English. Many of these parasites are responsible for black-mailing illegal immigrants, running mini Mafia-type set ups, and generally encouraging crime. Others find

Contd. overleaf

WORKERS AGAINST IMMIGRATION

Contd. from previous page

legal forms of exploitation, such as running extortionate employment agencies. Asian employment agencies take advantage of both the Race Relations Act and the immigrants, by charging £12 minimum for their 'service'. The owner of one of these agencies, a Mr. Mohammed Abdul Aziz, told a *Guardian* reporter, "I am very generous you know. I feel for these people. At the same time I feel for British industrial supremacy" (!). Whereas in general Asian workers prefer their own culture, remain in their own social group and are not aggressive, the West Indians demand integration and many are prone to violence where this is slow in coming. Among managers' comments in a race survey were: "West Indians have caused trouble with their arrogance. They have a chip on their shoulder from the word go. No matter how you try and nurse them along it comes out." "They are truculent and troublesome." "They expect preferential treatment," etc. Supervisors have found that if they have to reprimand a West Indian worker he claims that he is being "picked on" because of his colour. However the reverse is more often the reality because white workers do not tend to stick together as do the immigrants. If racial tension should break out into a fight between a white worker and an immigrant (as it has often been known to do), the management will invariably sack the white worker — for fear of all the other immigrants walking out. Due to enormous and continual pressure by race relations bodies, many West Indians now hold positions of power at both local and national executive level in trade unions. This is not immediately apparent to many British workers because most West Indians have English sounding names, i.e. a Jamaican, Bill Morris, was the first immigrant member of the T.G.W.U. Executive. This is also occasionally the case with Asians' surnames. Ambitious immigrants also tend to receive the support of white trade unionists of one-time foreign origin. Combined with the Marxist element, these forces make up the vociferous anti-British section in the trade union movement.

WORKERS FIGHT BACK

No other country treats its foreigners as a privileged class; and no foreign governments have been as treacherous to their own people as the Tory and Labour Governments have been on this issue to the British. Foreign labour working in Europe cannot vote in local or national elections, even if from another European country; and in France immigrants are not even allowed to be trade union officials. The German foreigners law states: "Foreigners enjoy all the basic rights, with the exception of the basic rights of freedom of assembly, freedom of association, freedom of movement, free choice of oc-

cupation, place of employment and place of education, as well as protection from extradition abroad." Only in Britain is the government malignant enough to betray its working people. Trade unionists can play a vital part in ending this perfidy by demanding an end to immigration and a programme of phased repatriation for the immigrants. The immigrants' selfish intentions to settle in our already overcrowded country, and the criminal activities of the race mixers, can no longer be tolerated. The majority of immigrants who have come here are both better off and better educated than most of their countrymen. It is therefore their moral duty to return and help build up their own country — instead of imposing themselves on our already problem-filled society. Well-financed repatriation will not involve any hardship for the immigrants, and is a very small price to pay for avoiding a very serious future social problem. Race relations officials could also be repatriated (unfinanced) to their spiritual home — the Soviet Union. All the signs at the present time point to a growing racial awareness among the British working class, and a rejection of class consciousness in favour of a more realistic racial consciousness. This has come about for various reasons, i.e. the obvious presence of the immigrants, the remoteness of union leaders, the failings, corruption and deceit of Establishment politicians and not least their own employer's failure to take account of white people's wishes concerning immigration. In the vast majority of cases no attempt is made by companies to ascertain the feelings of British workers before they employ immigrant labour. The reason is obvious. Though British workers have had to accept the immigrants (temporarily), the overwhelming majority would infinitely prefer white workmates. As one general manager speaking of workers' attitudes to immigrants put it, "I suppose they accept them. But if you put it to a vote, they'd rather be without them!" Some managements have been approached unofficially by shop stewards conveners, urging their company not to employ any more immigrants because "The lads are getting upset." And despite the massive propaganda campaign for industrial integration and the inhibiting Race Relations Act, many British workers are waking up to the fact that they can do something to oppose immigration. Many have given up their support of the Labour Party because of its betrayal of working class interests, and are now joining and voting for patriotic organisations like the National Front. More and more racial strikes and walk-outs are occurring. The '72 Loughborough Strike was correctly seen by many race relations experts as a sign of things to come. The demonstration by dockers in '68 in support of Enoch Powell and by the meat porters in 1972 against the entry of the Uganda Asians made many trade unionists realise what can be done. The meat porters who marched through the heart

of London chanting, "If they're black — send 'em back," "Get the blacks off our backs," and "Stop Immigration — Start Repatriation," echoed the feelings of millions of British working people. More and more trade unionists are refusing to be intimidated by race relations officials and are openly declaring that they will not be pushed around in their own country. As one engineering shop steward put it, "I didn't fight in a World War so that a black foreigner could come here and tell me what to do!" Numerous Social and Working Men's Clubs, especially in the North, continue to discriminate in favour of the British worker, and have defiantly resisted and defeated Race Board intimidation. It is indeed inevitable that if the race-mixers and black power advocates continue to throw down the gauntlet to white workers — some of those workers are going to pick it up! And more likely than not, the ones who do will be the trade unionists of the National Front.

SUPPORT THE N.F. BUILDING FUND

Now that elections are over for the time being, the biggest National Front money raising project is going to be its new Building Fund.

The National Directorate has decided that the growing needs of the party require a building considerably larger than its present premises in Croydon, better situated and more smartly appointed. It is intended that the new building will have facilities for a club, for a printing works and for special accommodation for members visiting the London area from the provinces.

The building must be in every way a credit to the party and a symbol of its growing strength. It is also considered by almost all members to be vital that it be under the complete ownership of the party.

The intention of the party is to raise a special fund to cover a deposit on the building, and then, having acquired it, to put it to use in a way that will easily enable instalments on a loan to be paid off.

The party needs contributions for this fund from all supporters, and it needs them NOW! Please send in your contributions and mark them: 'National Front, Building Fund Account'. Contributions should be sent to: 50 Pawsons Road, Croydon CR0 2QF.

SHIPWRECKED!

A STORY WITH A MORAL

by John Tyndall

*Drawings by
Roy Bowles*

ONCE upon a time there was a ship called the S.S. Bountiful, sailing, with a crew of six plus twenty passengers, over the wide ocean. One night the ship hit a storm and was sunk. Six were drowned but the remaining twenty managed to get away in lifeboats and the following morning found themselves within sight of an island, where they put ashore. They named the island after their ship, Bountiful Island.

After a few days on the island the twenty survivors came around to taking stock of their position. They were in a remote part of the ocean and the prospect of rescue in the near future was small. The ship's radio had been destroyed in the wreck and communication with the world beyond was non-existent.

On the good side, the island offered some tolerable means of life. There were ample fish in the sea. There was ample fruit, including oranges, bananas and coconuts. There were some animals on the island which could be slaughtered for meat and for the means of clothing. There was timber out of which dwellings could be built, and much besides.

And the shipwrecked party included some capable people in the trades and professions. There was Jones, the builder. There was Roberts, the doctor. There was Watson, the farmer, and Billings, the greengrocer. There was Gray, the local government official and Moss the banker. There was Mrs. Watson, who could sew and knit expertly. And there were more.

The party met one morning in a hastily improvised hut and decided to organise themselves for survival on the island until rescue came. A community, the Bountiful Islanders, was born.

Gradually, the rudiments of an economy took shape. Jones undertook to build dwellings for the islanders. Roberts guaranteed to care for the sick. Watson looked after the animals that were to be used for food and clothing, while his wife used their hides and their wool to make clothes for the day when the islander's existing attire wore out. Billings picked and sold fruit. Gray looked after the central administration of the island's affairs, codified


some simple laws, assisted in the marking out of property boundaries between different families and convened the meetings of the island's council.

At first all produce of the island was considered as being communally owned and shared out equally. In time, however, this caused dissatisfaction, as some worked harder and produced more than others. Some had greater skills to give, while others had lesser skills and yet others no skills. A system of exchange was clearly required, in fact a kind of elementary private enterprise.

The island council met and deliberated on how this could be effected. It was agreed that the first necessity was some form of currency that could act as a means of exchange. The little bit of old cash that the islanders had in their pockets was clearly useless for this purpose. However, on a part of the shore there were to be found masses of sea-shells. The islanders agreed that this part of the shore be cordoned off and the sea-shells all collected for use as currency. To begin with, the sea-shells would be distributed equally among the twenty islanders in quantities of a hundred each. Of course, as trade between them proceeded this equality of sea-shells would disappear, as different goods and services would bring

different payment and as the industrious would earn more than the indolent. It was agreed to keep a spare stock of sea-shells in communal custody to allow for the growth of the island economy. Obviously, in time as more wealth was produced more sea-shells would be required to enable the community to consume it.

The system worked very well. In six months' time a stock was taken of all the food, all the clothing, all the dwellings and other things on the island. They had all increased, and a situation was developing in which there was a shortage of sea-shells to enable their sale between one islander and another. The increase was reckoned to be 10 per-cent, and so 10 per-cent more sea-shells were brought out of the stock — another 200 sea-shells. At first there was the problem of how to distribute these sea-shells but this was quickly resolved. By this time it was possible to estimate each islander's regular rate of income. Some shells were handed out to each in a quantity related to his or her income. Some were kept for use by the community, for by now the maintenance of communal services had become something of an expense. Gray had to be paid a salary and the upkeep of his office had to be paid for too.



Over the years by this process the island thrived. Regularly more sea-shells were brought into circulation in keeping with the increased wealth, and duly the increased numbers, of the community — for in time some of the wives bore children and they then grew up to be old enough to perform some useful work. The number of sea-shells circulating was always calculated carefully so as to be equal to the increased size of the island economy. This way the sea-shell maintained its value over the years and the incentive to save or invest was likewise maintained.

By now all the islanders had far more sea-shells than they normally wanted for daily business. The shells were cumbersome and difficult to keep in the islanders' huts. They took up too much space and they were easy to steal. An idea was hit upon: why not start a bank? Mr. Moss could run the bank and people could deposit their shells with him. Moss undertook to do this and in due course established a reputation as an efficient and reliable banker. People then began to carry out their transactions without sea-shells. They simply wrote out IOUs on bits of paper, signed them and handed them to each other. The payee then presented the bit of paper to Mr. Moss and he made a note to transfer so many sea-shells to that person's account from the account of the payer.

LENDING THE MONEY

With the development of the island economy a problem had now arisen that with so many people having sea-shells to spare and having deposited them with Moss at his bank a great number of sea-shells were piling up which were not in circulation. At the same time the expanding economy was needing more and more money. Some people wanted money they didn't currently possess so as to start new enterprises or expand old ones. It was decided to authorise Moss to lend money, i.e. sea-shells, to these people from out of the stocks that he was holding from his depositors. In this way the currency of the island was fully circulating again and business expanded.

The cumbersomeness of the sea-shells, however, made it much more practical for these loans to be transacted through IOUs, as other business had largely been for some time. Therefore Moss was allowed to let his customers write out IOUs many sea-shells in excess of those recorded in their account and then repay the sums later with interest as they passed, in sea-shells, the earnings from their expanded enterprises over the counter to him at his bank.

There was one important proviso to this which all the islanders thought obvious. Whereas Moss might allow one customer to pass IOUs in excess of the number of sea-shells credited to his account, the overall total of IOUs in circulation must never be in

excess of the overall number of sea-shells deposited in all the accounts at his bank.

Moss paid his customers interest on their deposits. The borrowers paid him a higher rate of interest on their loans. The difference in the two rates of interest went to Moss himself, and this was considered fair remuneration for the services and skills which he rendered to the community.

One day, however, the islanders woke up with a new problem. For years they had got used to employing sea-shells as their only cash currency and they could not conceive of any other form of cash currency. Now, however, the stock of sea-shells on the beach was exhausted. No more could be found. How were the islanders to continue financing their increased trade? The island council hurriedly met and discussed the matter.

WHY NOT PEBBLES?

After they had deliberated for some time without result, Dr. Roberts came up with an idea. "I've got it," he said. "It's so simple I wonder we haven't thought of it before! On another part of the shore there is a place where there's millions of little pebbles. These aren't to be found anywhere else on the island. Let's cordon off this part of the shore and use these pebbles as a supplementary currency — two pebbles to be equal to one sea-shell. As the economy expands in future, we'll just issue pebbles instead of sea-shells while keeping as legal tender those sea-shells already in circulation. There are enough pebbles to last for hundreds of years."

Somehow, however, the habit of using only sea-shells, or paper IOUs for sea-shells, had dug deep into the psychology of the islanders. Simple and obvious though the Doctor's idea was, it seemed strange and unnatural to them.

It was at this point that Moss began to speak. For some time he had been doing a study of the rate of sea-shells coming into his bank and the rate of loans that his customers had been raising through the use of IOUs. He had discovered that, although officially he was not supposed to issue a total of IOUs greater than the total of sea-shells deposited with him, it would be easy for him to do so without the community being any the wiser about it. Apart from himself, all the members of the community were uninterested in banking matters and never thought much about their mechanics. It would never occur to them to check whether his IOUs were equal to his sea-shell deposits or not. He could in fact issue IOUs far in excess of the sea-shells he had in his custody and get away with it. He would later be paid with interest. Instead of the modest living he was currently making, he could make a fortune. He would be paid with interest money for all the IOUs he issued, but in fact as only a fraction of these IOUs rep-

resented sea-shells repayable to his depositors, the remainder would simply amount to money created out of nothing!

Of course the system would in theory collapse if every trader at his bank wanted his money solely in sea-shells, that is to say if every depositor wanted to draw out all his money in sea-shells or all those raising loans wanted their loans in sea-shells. There simply would not be enough sea-shells to go round.

But Moss's years of experience told him that this in fact never happened. IOUs had become as accepted a form of currency as sea-shells themselves. People simply didn't want to clutter up their pockets or their huts with sea-shells; IOUs were so much easier to pass around.

Now Moss addressed the gathering. "I have," he said, "the solution to your problem. Whenever new money is needed to finance the expansion of trade within the island, I will provide it with the issue of an IOU. All of you now accept IOUs as a normal form of payment for goods and services. You can obtain the IOUs from me as a loan, and this can be paid back from out of the profits of increased trade. Why bother with primitive things like pebbles? We have grown more sophisticated now. This system will function much better."

"MOSS IS THE EXPERT"

The islanders were impressed by Moss's arguments and they agreed to adopt the system he prescribed. He would provide, through IOUs, all the new money for the expanding economy and this would be paid back from out of the profits of increased trade. It sounded good. And, after all, Moss was the expert on monetary matters. He should know. When the islanders were sick, they sent for Roberts, the doctor. When they had monetary problems, they should obviously follow the advice of Moss. It made sense.

At that time it was estimated that about 50,000 sea-shells were in existence as money on the island. Some of these were in the possession of the islanders as petty cash, while the remainder were stored in Moss's vaults — with IOUs to an equivalent amount circulating around the island.

With the gross island product increasing at about 10 per-cent a year, money to the equivalent of 5,000 sea-shells was needed to finance that trade during the coming year. It could have been provided in the form of 10,000 green pebbles, but Moss had persuaded the islanders not to do that. Instead he issued IOUs to the value of 5,000 sea-shells as loans. Some of these were to private traders, some were to the island council to finance the building of a new communal recreation centre. The rate of interest was 10 per-cent and the period for repayment was fixed at 10 years.

At first the system seemed to work excellently. The new IOUs facilitated a great increase in business and the economy prospered everywhere.

In due course, however, the money borrowed from Moss had to be paid back. Now some islanders had done so well out of the increased trade that they were able to pay back what they had borrowed from Moss with the necessary interest. Their gross profits had well exceeded 10 per-cent each year, and so they were left with a handsome net profit after the loan had been settled.

But for the island taken as a whole it was a different story. Loans amounting to a total of 5,000 sea-shells had been raised by private traders and by the council. Over 10 years these had to be paid back plus 10 per-cent interest every year. Money to the value of 10,000 sea-shells had to be paid back to Moss.

No more sea-shells had been put into circulation during this period, as the stock of sea-shells had been exhausted, and the community had decided against using green pebbles as a supplementary currency. Where then was the money to pay this 10,000 sea-shells to come from?

As the total amount of money now circulating within the island economy was

money, not less. They approached Moss and sought his advice. They said: "We want to honour our debts to you but you realise that if we do that'll leave us with less money than we started with. There will simply be inadequate money to finance the island's trade. What can we do?"

Moss replied: "I can appreciate your problem and I want to help you. Now let us look at the books and see how much money has been paid back and how much is still owing."

It was found from the books that 2,000 sea-shells of the principal originally borrowed had been paid back and in addition 2,000 sea-shells had been paid in interest. That meant that only 1,000 sea-shells were left out of the original amount that had been borrowed — 1,000 sea-shells to add to the island's original capital of 50,000. The island was very short of money and production had gone down. Some islanders were off work and others were on short time. There simply wasn't enough money to buy all the goods that would be available if production was at full stretch.

"This is what I will do," Moss said. "You have between you to repay 3,000 sea-shells principal with interest on 5,000 of 10 per-cent a year. Obviously, you can't do

rescue again by extending the credit terms and the repayment period. Everyone thought what a valuable fellow Moss was. What would they do without him?

Of course, the figures we have been dealing with related to the sum total of money borrowed by the islanders as a whole. From one individual to another their ability to repay varied greatly. As we have said, some were very successful and could pay, but for every one that could pay there was another who could not pay. Many islanders simply could not repay their debts at all, whether over a shorter or a longer period. They went to Moss and confessed their position.

"Oh well, never mind," Moss said, "if you cannot repay me in cash you can repay me in assets. I'll accept these as settlement of your debts."

MOSS TAKES CONTROL

In consequence one asset after another became made over to Moss. The bankrupt farmers surrendered to him their farms, and were then allowed to continue working these farms for him at a wage. The same happened to the owners of fruit businesses, fisheries, clothing businesses, the new and growing entertainment trade, in fact assets of every kind. Moss became far and away the richest man on the island. By this time the island had a weekly newspaper, the *Bountiful Island Chronicle*. It went bankrupt by being unable to pay its debts and Moss became its owner. Henceforth he controlled the island's news.

However, the islanders did not immediately object. After all, the economy continued running, whoever owned most of the wealth. So long as food was available, it did not seem to matter whether Moss supplied it or the previous farmer. The same was true of other goods and services.

But now a new phenomenon started to enter into the island economy. Prices of all goods and services started to rise steadily. Previously there had been periodic fluctuations in the prices of specific items but these always balanced each other out. If one item rose in price, another had to fall, since there was only so much money chasing so many goods and services on the island. An all round price rise was impossible as long as the island council, by its issue of sea-shells, maintained a constant equilibrium between money and real wealth.

But now this equilibrium no longer existed. The factor of debt had entered into the reckoning. The islanders collectively owed Moss money, and the amount of money they owed him increased from year to year. This meant that the interest payable on the money increased. An ever growing proportion of the whole money circulating on the island had to be set aside as debt owing to Moss.

This was bound to cause a general price



55,000 sea-shells (the original 50,000 plus the borrowed 5,000) if 10,000 were paid to Moss that would leave only 45,000 sea-shells — 5,000 less than the original amount.

And as trade and wealth by this time had increased considerably since the time when 50,000 sea-shells was enough to finance it, should only 45,000 sea-shells be in circulation there would quite obviously be totally inadequate money about. The economy would stagnate through insufficient purchasing power and insufficient investment. This obviously could not be allowed to happen.

Long before the final payments of the debts to Moss were due, the islanders realised their problem. Their economy needed more

it. Therefore I will offer to you a new credit arrangement. I will alter your loan to 10,000 sea-shells to be repaid over 20 years at 10 per-cent, i.e. 1,500 a year. In this way 10,000 sea-shells worth of new money will flow into the economy of which in the first year only 1,500 will have to be paid back to me. That should get the economy moving."

The islanders were most grateful to Moss for his generosity. He had saved them from possible ruin. They returned to their work.

The process was repeated a year or so later. Repayments of loans to Moss plus the interest due threatened to render the island short of money. Moss came to the

rise. Up to that time the price of every item sold was made up of no more than the following components: labour, materials, overheads, depreciation, profits. Now a new component entered into things: interest charges. Interest charges on money borrowed from Moss became a factor in every item for sale on the island. The price of every item was bound consequently to rise.

As one example, the island council had previously had an annual expenditure of 1,000 sea-shells. This it had been able to raise by issuing that many sea-shells from the reserve stock as new currency backed up by a commensurate increase of the wealth of island during the year. This had, in most years, spared the islanders the burden of paying taxes.

Now, however, the council could not do this. It therefore had to pay for its budget by levying taxes. There was a limit here to what the islanders were prepared to pay, and only 700 sea-shells could be raised in taxes. The remaining 300 sea-shells had to be borrowed from Moss and paid back at an interest of 10 per-cent.

MORE AND MORE BORROWED

From year to year this got worse. As prices rose everywhere the bill for public expenditure rose. This meant that more and more had to be borrowed from Moss. The servicing charges on Moss's loan rose astronomically and came to represent half the council budget. Taxes inevitably had to rise to meet these charges. Every islander had to make over more and more of his gross earnings to the council, although the actual sum total of public services that he was receiving in return was just the same as of old. With more and more money going in taxes, every business on the island had less and less money to maintain itself, let alone expand. All businesses therefore had to borrow more and more from Moss to stave off complete bankruptcy.

Now with price increases on the rampage everywhere the wage-earning islanders grew restless. Their money, which stayed the same, would buy less and less. They teamed together and demanded wage increases.

Of course the wage increases could only be granted by the creation of more and more money, so yet more loans were requested of Moss. More and more IOUs circulated around the island by authorisation from Moss, and the rate at which these increased bore no relation whatever to the rate at which the real physical wealth of the island rose. The increased wages that the workers obtained, therefore, consisted simply of worthless money. As fast as their wages went up, prices went up too.

Things could not continue indefinitely in this way. The *Bountiful Island Chronicle* reported: "We've got to stop this inflation or it'll ruin us. Inflation is occurring because



everyone's wage is going up and that increase is written into the price of goods. We will only stop inflation if we have a law of wage restraint."

The island council duly met and voted in favour of wage restraint. All wages were frozen. This, however, did not prevent prices increasing, as everybody had hoped. Prices continued going up, while the workers, whose wages remained the same, grew poorer and poorer in real purchasing power.

The *BIC* then came out with a new headline. "Wage restraint is not enough," it cried. "The fact is that there's too much money in circulation. The council has got to stop this indiscriminate flow of money."

The council met yet again and Moss spoke: "As the *BIC* correctly stated the other day, we have got to stop this indiscriminate flow of money. I cannot lend you any more money until you've paid me what you owe me. If that means that you have nothing left to spend on anything else, so be it. It's unfortunate, but it's the only way to stop inflation. You've all got to tighten your belts. The council has got to cut down on public expenditure. You've all got to accept a lower standard of living in the island's interest. This is your patriotic duty."

SOME BEG, OTHERS STARVE

So no more money flowed into the economy as loans, while all the islanders endeavoured to repay with interest their debts to Moss. To do this they had to cut almost all other expenditure down to zero. Ninety per-cent of the islander's budget, both private and public, went to repaying the loans. Purchasing power fell catastrophically. Investment was non-existent. Workers were laid off. Some went begging. Others starved.

In time it was obvious that even if every penny that every islander had was paid to Moss it wouldn't clear up the debts. So even more assets had to be surrendered

to the banker. Eventually, Moss owned all the property, all the plant, everything on the island except for the tattered clothes that the other islanders stood up in.

Years later a ship sailed into the area and sighted the island. Its captain, curious, took a boat ashore. Expecting only to find a few birds and animals there, he was amazed to find the island littered everywhere with human skeletons. This amazement grew when one or two of these skeletons were found to be standing — and actually moving! He approached one of them and, with a pitying look at the man's rags and half-dead expression, asked him: "Is there anyone in charge here?"

The man beckoned to him to follow him, and led him up a path to a sumptuous mansion in which there sat amid beautiful furniture a well fed figure, now quite grey, helping himself to various delicacies out of a plate held by a haggard looking servant, while other servants, similarly haggard, hustled about attending to the figure's every want.

The ship's captain spoke: "I don't know how long you've been here," he said, "but I can find room for you on my ship and take you back to civilisation."

"Thank you," the large figure replied. "Allow me to introduce myself — my name is Moss. I am the King of Bountiful Island. We appreciate your offer, but we prefer to remain here. We have all the civilisation we want. Why should we wish to move?"

He glanced, as if requiring confirmation from the flunkies around him. Terror on their pale and drawn faces, they nodded their assent. "Yes," they said, "why should we wish to move?"

Perplexed, the captain turned on his heel and walked back to the shore, climbed in his boat and made way back to his ship. The ship sailed away, never to return.

So ends the story of the survivors of S.S. Bountiful. Whether you regard it as a happy ending or a sad ending depends, one supposes, on your point of view. J.T.

Reflation without inflation

PROFESSOR FRIEDRICH VON HAYEK, last year's winner of the Nobel Prize for Economics, in his article on "Inflation's path to Unemployment", in the *Daily Telegraph*, 15.10.74, states that no government can in fact stop inflation while preserving full employment.

He says that what we are experiencing are simply the economic consequences of Lord Keynes. He recommended governments to create more money "which every reputable economist before Keynes would have predicted would cause precisely the sort of inflation we have got."

With all due deference to Professor Friedrich von Hayek, monetary reformers are completely unconvinced by his arguments and conclusion, because, like all economists of the orthodox school, his basic assumptions are, in our opinion, erroneous, hence his conclusions are prejudiced.

Leaving theory aside for a moment and seeing life as it is, let us take the case of a Government requiring essential work to be done. A man undertakes to work for one week for X pounds. At the end of the week he receives in return for his services an I.O.U. from the State with which he can obtain from the common fund services or goods to the value of the I.O.U., or receipt, or credit note, or note. It is just a piece of paper entitling him to his just reward in kind, or in a form which he can save if he wishes.

In the same way, the Government could put a thousand men to work on constructing Municipal Houses, or any capital works, if the men and material resources are available. The end result is increased national wealth, and a thriving community. How has this been achieved? By the issue of receipts, or notes, by the Government.

Would anyone be foolish enough to say that work must not proceed because there is a shortage of receipts or notes? Yet that is what the nation is told now.

Would anyone say that the issue of notes creating all this activity and new wealth is creating inflation? By definition, inflation occurs when notes are issued without the corresponding increase in wealth.

Lord Keynes rescued the country from poverty amidst potential plenty. He advised public debt instead of human deprivation to millions, because he had both

a mind and a heart. But he told only half the story and left the nation with a half-baked policy — a time bomb of inflation — in order to placate vested interests. In other words, he left the debt system intact. Hence all our troubles.

As the above examples show, a Government or Corporation can pay in paper acknowledgments which cost nothing, and to justify curtailment of the use of all national resources because of shortage of liquidity is plain nonsense and sabotage of industry.

The tragedy of the present age (referring to the pre-Joseph era of British politics!) is that there is no really plain speaking on money matters. The public is deluged with arguments professing to seek a solution to inflation without mentioning certain vital facts. Or facts are obscured by terminology. This is especially so in regard to the creation of money.

It is agreed that the Government is the supreme authority for the creation of money. When passed by Parliament, written authority is issued by the Treasury for the creation of money by the banking system in exchange for Treasury notes or bills, which saddle the taxpayer for payment of interest on those bills for money created by the banks.

Now how is this procedure to be described in discussion? Has the new money been created by the Government (i.e. the State)? Or has it been created by the privately owned banking system by book-keeping procedure? (For modern money is only paper, as we have said — or even mere figures in a loan account).

As we see, the ultimate responsibility lies with the Government, but it allows itself to become debtor for the money it permits to be created. Its notes or bills are in themselves accepted as money of the highest order. There is no technical reason why the debt should be incurred. Similarly with the notes printed by the Government's own Issue Department of the Bank of England; they are Government property and should be at the disposal of the Government to spend directly into use without debt charges.

We must therefore discriminate between money created and spent direct by the State, and money created by the banking system which increases the national debt and has to be paid for at outrageously high interest rates.

We affirm that employing direct State finance for constructive work is wholly beneficial to the community. The same work financed by loans from the Public Works Loan Board at the running rate of interest will result in much higher costs and increased taxation. The gibe of 'printing press money' is always disingenuous because the Government alone possesses full authority for the creation of any money, and the alternative is bank credit which is debt finance at the national expense. When this gibe is made by banking authorities it is doubly discreditable because banks issue up

to ten times the value of notes in their tills. It is on this account that Government expenditure creates inflation by the action of the banks in multiplying up the amount of money in circulation. In the case recommended of Government direct spending, provision should be made to prevent banks using the money as a base for credit creation.

Inflation means a rise in the volume of money without a rise in national wealth, in goods and services available for sale. It is, basically, a relationship between money and goods for sale, or productive capacity of the community. Hence it can be created by: an increase in money by bank lending for speculation or for unconstructive purposes, rises in pay without increased output, increases in pensions, etc.

But to argue, as Mr Powell and Sir Keith Joseph do, that money must be drastically reduced, and thus curtail industry, is incorrect. It completely overlooks the fact that if money is spent directly into production by the State it results in new assets — in other words, the additional employment has created more wealth, as it should.

This possibility is always overlooked. It is treated as non-existent, or, if mentioned at all, it is ridiculed as the printing money way to destruction. We say in reply that the policy adopted in recent years has certainly destroyed our money, and that is why our prices have risen so much. It is not world prices that are too high so much as that our money is almost valueless.

The other vital factor which has militated against us is the high rate of interest which must be closely connected with the rate of inflation. This paramount factor is always kept out of discussions.

Inflation, being a relationship, can also be affected by strikes. Anything which reduces the rate of production must disturb the balance of money to goods. This is what Hugh Scanlon failed to see in his lively discussion on "Any Questions" on the 18th October. And Andrew Alexander failed to see that the rate of issue of money is only one factor, and that if issued by the right authority (the Government direct) industry can be re-activated, without inflation and without debt. And Lord Robens rightly stressed the need to increase production, but assumed that money would be forthcoming as a result.

If money were geared to nett increase in national wealth, without debt, the system would work well and be self-financing. But, as the last 100 years has shown, as national wealth increases, so does national debt. This crazy system is leading the world into a 1931 crisis all over again, because we have failed to learn the necessary lessons. The real wealth and productive capacity remains; what we lack are the right pieces of paper, because the politicians do not know that they have a right to issue them without mortgaging everything to bankers, a 15 per-cent interest.

Wall Street's ties with Communism

WALL STREET AND THE BOLSHEVIK REVOLUTION — Antony Sutton

Mr. Sutton sets out to establish "a link between some New York international bankers and many revolutionaries," and in this he is undoubtedly successful.

The author is British born and was a Research Fellow at the Hoover Institution, Stanford University, from 1968–1973 and is a former professor of economics at California State University. Radical nationalists will remember his fine work in establishing that perhaps 90–95 per-cent of Soviet technology came from the U.S. and its allies. Mr. Sutton suggests that academic writers have avoided a study of the links between financiers and the Bolshevik Revolution because the hypothesised link "offends the neat dichotomy of capitalists versus Communists", and, because of the absurdity of much that has been written on the subject. "A sound academic reputation could easily be wrecked," he says, "on the shoals of ridicule." We therefore have to commend Mr. Sutton's boldness in undertaking this study.

The author points out that the "Sisson's documents", known to many of us, which claimed that Trotsky, Lenin and others were paid German agents, are almost all forgeries, but that the forgers had access to good information as witnessed by their references to the Nya Banken in Stockholm, to Fürstenberg as the intermediary between the German government and Lenin, and to Olof Aschberg, the "Bolshevik Banker". According to Anthony Sutton, the documents were probably put into circulation to confuse the issue and prevent the public from learning the truth about the revolution.

There was German involvement, however, in that Chancellor Theobald von Bethmann-Hollweg approved Lenin's journey into Russia and there was also financial support for the revolutionaries. This was repaid by Russia's effective removal from the First World War after the revolution.

Sutton identifies the J. P. Morgan-dominated Guaranty Trust Company as the main supporter of the Bolsheviks. He shows that even before 1917, Wall Street interests had a hand in revolution, e.g. in Panama, in order to gain control of the canal, and in China in 1912 where they were promised railroad, banking and commercial concessions by Sun Yat-sen.

As well as Guaranty Trust, Sutton names Olof Aschberg's Nya Banken of Sweden as a source through which funds were channelled to the Bolsheviks. When the Soviets formed their first international bank, the Ruskombank, Max May, who was vice president of the Guaranty Trust Company, became director of the Ruskombank's

Foreign Division. In Sweden, Ruskombank was represented by Svenska Ekonomibolaget, Aschberg's Nya Banken under a new name, and in the U.S. by the Guaranty Trust Company. May said that the Ruskombank would "largely finance all lines of Russian industries".

In 1917 the American Red Cross organised a mission to Russia, but in contrast with a similar mission to Rumania in the same year, the majority of those who set out were lawyers, financiers and their assistants from the New York financial district. The mission was financed by William Boyce Thompson of the Federal Reserve Bank. Dr. Frank Billings, professor of medicine at the University of Chicago, and head of the mission, came home after one month saying he was disgusted with the overtly political activities of most of the mission. He brought all the medical personnel back with him. Sutton claims that the mission mainly concerned itself with political manoeuvring.

In February 1918, the *Washington Post* announced that William B. Thompson had made a personal contribution of one million dollars to the Bolsheviks "for the purpose of spreading their doctrine in Germany and Austria." Thompson said that the Bolsheviks had been misrepresented. Thompson and mining promoter, Raymond Robins (who was also on the Red Cross Mission to Russia) helped the communists by pleading with Lloyd George to abandon Britain's anti-Bolshevik position. Similar moves were made by Morgan partners H. P. Davison and Dwight W. Morrow. The latter wanted assistance for the Soviet government "in its efforts to organise a volunteer revolutionary army".

"The overriding motivation," says Sutton, "was the capturing of the postwar Russian market. This was a commercial, not an ideological, objective." Mr. Sutton uses the example of George F. Peabody, deputy chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank, to indicate why prominent capitalists were backing communism. Peabody had made a fortune out of railroad manipulation but was in the forefront of the move to bring the railways under public ownership. But this was just an attempt to use the power of the state to achieve a monopoly difficult to achieve under private enterprise.

"The idea of a centrally planned socialist Russia," says Sutton, "must have appealed to Peabody. Think of it — one gigantic state monopoly! And Thompson, his friend and fellow director, had the inside track with the boys running the operation!"

It is impossible in such a short space to deal with all the facets of the financier-

communist link revealed by Anthony Sutton, but the following items should provide food for thought. Ludwig Martens, head of the Soviet Bureau (situated in the Wall Street district of New York) boasted, according to the *New York Times*, "that most of the big business houses of the country were aiding him in his effort to get the government to recognise the Soviet government." American troops were fighting the Soviets at the time.

In January, 1918, only two months after the revolution and with only a fraction of Russia under Bolshevik control, William Franklin Sands, executive secretary of the American International Corporation (on which Morgan and Rockefeller interests were represented) pressed for recognition of the communists and for economic assistance. Shortly afterwards the American-Russian Industrial Syndicate Inc. was formed to exploit Russian markets. The finance came from the Guggenheim Brothers, Harry F. Sinclair of Sinclair Gulf Corp. and James G. White of J. G. White Engineering Corp. Lenin recognised (in his own words) that "without the assistance of capital it will be impossible for us to retain proletarian power in an incredibly ruined country," and American capitalism was all too ready to help bring about diplomatic recognition and establish trading links. Firms who provided help were rewarded with sizeable contracts.

Why all this assistance? Mr. Sutton's explanation is that this was an attempt by a group of financiers and the corporations under their control to monopolise Russia's untapped markets; that the people involved were "power-motivated" rather than ideologically motivated. What financiers and communists have in common is internationalism, and as Anthony Sutton says "Revolution and international finance are not at all inconsistent if the result of revolution is to establish more centralized authority."

What financiers fear is a dispersal of power. The author concludes "Wall Street did indeed achieve its goal. American firms controlled by this syndicate were later to go on and build the Soviet Union, and today are well on their way to bringing the Soviet military-industrial complex into the age of the computer."

This is certainly one of the most important books on politics in the last decade and in spite of this (some would say because of this) it is likely to be completely ignored in Establishment circles. Mr. Sutton's scholarship and reluctance to draw sweeping conclusions from insufficient evidence are impressive. His analysis is almost totally consistent with that of the radical right in this country, and provides an excellent challenge to the orthodox theory of capitalist-communist division in politics. *Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution* will probably become a classic of the radical right and is definitely recommended to those who wish to know the true history of our times.

Copyright © 1975 Paul Kingsley

ALANNA SHELMEKDINE

Rhodesia No sell-out

DON'T you think it rather strange that, after 10 years of boycotts and sanctions, Britain has suddenly taken a keen interest in Rhodesia?

However, this is not because our Government is at last recognising that white rule is beneficial to both blacks and whites but because there appears to be a slim chance of its beloved black brothers seizing control, thus screwing yet another nail into the white man's coffin. These perverted ethno-masochists who call themselves statesmen will stop at nothing less than black communism, despite the disastrous consequences.

Rhodesia and South Africa have quite obviously been a painful thorn in the side of world communism and it must have hurt the Internationalists far more when the economic sanctions, which were supposed to wreck Rhodesia's economy within months, did little more than strengthen the White Man's resolve to carry on.

However, now that there are signs of weakness on Vorster's part towards his Rhodesian neighbours, Callaghan can't fly out quickly enough to talk to black nationalist (sic) leaders, together with Mr. Vorster. Although they stated quite categorically that they would never recognise Rhodesia and, at the time, some Members of Parliament even suggested bombing the country, the Labour Government now has the impertinence to suggest that Callaghan presides over any constitutional conference that may (God forbid) occur.

Obviously the political position of Rhodesia has weakened following the Frelimo coup in Mozambique but, nevertheless, I feel that South Africa is capitulating under the tyrannical noose of Internationalism and the inevitable Socialist vultures are waiting on the sidelines ready for the kill.

South Africa must at all costs support Rhodesia in order for the White Man to survive in Africa, because if Rhodesia falls then South Africa itself will ultimately fall, and unless Vorster is ousted at their next elections in favour of a stronger leader I fear the Rhodesian sell-out is in the offing.

Smith is not the champion of the right-wing as many people think but he is a natural leader, and his party, the Rhodesian Front, have always made clear their intentions not to surrender to the Blacks.

This is why the release of certain black nationalist leaders from jail in Rhodesia recently has angered the Rhodesian Front and given hope to the hungry vultures. Quite naturally, Smith's colleagues were annoyed because he had apparently spoken



EXPLOSIVES CAPTURED FROM TERRORISTS IN RHODESIA
Russian markings make origin clear.

more to the press than to his own Cabinet, and we must certainly hope that these moves are not followed up by an assurance of majority rule within a limited period of time.

As far as we in the National Front are concerned, it is imperative that our recognition and support of white rule is followed up by sending written word to the Rhodesian

Front. As yet the National Front has not got the power to implement its foreign policy towards South Africa and Rhodesia, but at this time of crisis it is up to all nationalists in Britain to let our Rhodesian friends know that they are not forgotten and that we support in every way their wonderful stand against the forces of evil threatening to destroy them.

How to obtain SPEARHEAD

Spearhead is available from our office to those who wish to ensure obtaining copies for themselves every month and to those who wish to obtain quantities for redistribution.

Those wishing for copies for themselves each month should take out a subscription by filling in the form below and sending it to us with a cheque or postal order for the amount applicable.

NAME

ADDRESS

IF OVERSEAS, SEALED OR UNSEALED

SURFACE MAIL OR AIR MAIL

RATES (12 issues):


British Isles:	£2.22
Overseas surface mail:	£2.10 unsealed
	£3.12 sealed
Overseas air mail:	£3.54
(unsealed)	Canada, U.S.A., S. America,
	Africa, Middle East
	£4.02 Australia, New Zealand,
	Far East

Discounts can be obtained for bulk purchases as follows:—

20—49 copies:	11p each
50—99 copies:	9p each
100—249 copies:	8p each
250 copies and over:	6p each

PLEASE NOTE: These overseas rates apply as above if remittance is by international money order; if remittance is by cheque an additional charge of 25p applies, as our bankers require this as commission for the handling of all foreign cheques.

All cheques or postal orders should be made out to *Spearhead* and sent to: 50 Pawsons Road, Croydon, CRO 2QF, Surrey.



SIR: I congratulate Mr. D. I. Jones upon his splendid article in last month's *Spearhead*. He has put into words most eloquently what I and I hope many Welshmen, have felt about Plaid Cymru for a long time; that it is a very cunning Red Wolf parading in the Green and Silver livery of Wales in order to deceive our people.

It is, as he says, vital that Welsh be spoken as well as English at meetings, and that the Red Dragon be displayed alongside the Union flag.

The Con-Lab-Lib monopolists who have recently "reorganised for progress" our old county system of local Government have already cashed-in on Welsh sentiment, misappropriating for their own benefit the names of some of our ancient Kingdoms, but may I suggest that it would nevertheless be a very good thing to identify NF branches, as they arise, by the names of an ancient Prince of each Region, and of course, to display his Arms? Few things stir the hearts and imagination of patriots like the ancient flags of their forefathers? (However, lest Plaid Cymru get in first, I think it might be best not to discuss such a suggestion in public).

Writing as an armigerous descendant of several of the ancient Welsh Princes, I should be glad to offer any advice on this subject, and, as a specialist in heraldic drawing, I offer my services as well if the time came to design suitable flags and letter-head heraldry.

HUGH. P. MATTHEW
Great Dunmow, Essex.

SIR: Your contributor Richard Stoner seems in his article last month, 'Economic power: Freedom or World Government?', to be seeking to justify Keynesian finance, at least in the context of the pre-war slump period. Granted that he says in a subsequent part of the article that Keynesian doctrine has been the cause of modern Britain's ills, but this does not erase his statement that the Keynes approach to unemployment in the 1930s was "undoubtedly correct".

Correct it certainly was not in anything but the very short term. Keynes' theory was that purchasing power and investment during the 1930s was inadequate to sustain the expansion of the economy and the consequent improvement in the employment situation that was physically possible, and that therefore there had to be a greatly increased flow of money into the economy to make good that shortage. So far, so good, But it was in the manner by which this increased flow of money was created that the fundamental flaw of Keynesian economics existed and still exists.

Keynes prescribed that the new money be created as a deficit, that is that it be brought into existence as a loan and therefore subject to repayment with interest. In this he was in fact advocating nothing that was new, only a mere extension of a system of finance that has ruled in Britain since Cromwell. As this money has had to be paid back we have been forced to perpetuate the system by continually raising new loans, for the alternative — so long as we keep faith with Keynes — would be slump on a scale that the Thirties never dreamed of.

What the Government should have done in the Thirties — and what was indeed done in some of the authoritarian states of Europe — was to create, debt free, the money necessary to get the economy moving at full stretch and to secure full employment. Contrary to popular fallacy, this would not

have resulted in inflation so long as the increased wealth created by the upsurge in economic activity was equal to the money spent.

Do I take it from the article in question that *Spearhead* supports Keynes' theory?

R. S. BRAIN
Swindon, Wilts.

(Editor's note: *Spearhead* does not support Keynes. As we state on page 2, views expressed in signed articles are the sole responsibility of their authors and do not necessarily represent those of the Editor).

SIR: It is indicative of the spirit of the times that the mass media should dedicate such great space to discussion of how Mrs. Thatcher's assumption of the Tory leadership is likely to affect the image of the party, and so little to the question of its implications for Tory policy.

So far we have heard nothing that suggests that Mrs. Thatcher's policies are going to be any different from those of Heath. Surely it was Heath's policies first and foremost that were disastrous for his party and for the country. It looks like we can assume that these policies will still be pursued. If so, God help poor Britain!

B. WARNER
Inverness.

LETTER OF THE MONTH

Spearhead publishes the best letter to the press on National Front policy every month. Send your cutting to us not later than the 15th. of the month. You could win a £1 Nationalist Books voucher. This month's winner (below) was published in the *South London Press*.

I WAS particularly interested in your Opinion (Discouraging the boy muggers, *South London Press*, January 10). For the past three or four years you have been guilty of adopting a low profile attitude towards black violence in the Brixton area.

Therefore it makes a refreshing change when you state that most muggers are coloured immigrants which is more than some newspapers will admit for fear of the Race Relations Board.

One needs only to look at your front page to see how immigrant violence has increased in the 1970s.

Given then that this problem exists, and is likely to exist for some time, how do

we set about solving it? One answer which some individuals implicitly believe is "ignore it and it will go away."

The pitfalls in that kind of logic speak for themselves. You can ignore final demands from the Gas Board but it will certainly not solve any solutions.

Then we have the "blame it on society" school of thought which seems to be rather fashionable in trendy circles at the moment. If I choose to steal money by coshing someone over the head that is my decision for which I alone am responsible.

To say that immigrants are not responsible for their own criminal acts of violence is frankly so much eyewash. It is pathetic that the budding Dr. Heinz Kiosks are so readily believed when the facts speak to the contrary.

There are many more diverse cures to the street violence problem ranging from "it is only a phase which will die out so do nothing" to sending in the Special Patrol Group with truncheons which would only cause a partial halt in street muggings.

The only way to solve the problem is what the National Front have always said. Stop immigration and start repatriation. To those who think this sounds racist—it is, but there is nothing wrong with racism.

If putting your people and your country first means being branded as a racist then Britain is in an even worse way than I had thought possible.—K. Wright, National Front Lambeth Branch, 100 Lewin-rd., Streatham.

Trouble shooting

More Black Cabbies — By Order

During the past three years there has been a marked increase in the number of Coloured Immigrant cabbies driving licensed vehicles (as opposed to mini-cabs). The number of black cabbies is not enough to suit the officials of the Race Relations Board and the Community Relations Commission, however.

According to whispers from officials of the Licensed Taxi Drivers' Association overheard in one or two cab drivers' shelters in recent weeks, the big shots of the Race Relations industry have issued a circular to the cab licensing and regulating body (a department of the Metropolitan Police) stating that the rate of passes for coloured persons sitting for the cabbies qualifying examination must be speeded up.

Traditionally the test for London cabbies has been rigorous. Not only must entrants be of good character but they must pass a very difficult "knowledge" examination. To pass this they must be able to memorise the name and location of practically every road and side-turning in London, and describe the quickest way to get from street 'A' to road 'B' across the other side of town, taking account of all one-way systems and diversions. They must know all the important hotels, clubs and shops.

To pass this student cabbies go "on the knowledge". They can be seen driving around London on mopeds with a clip board fixed to the handlebars. Bright people with almost photographic memories can sometimes sit and pass the exam within eight or nine months of going "on the knowledge". Many cabbies take as long as a year or 18 months.

The examiners are extremely exacting, and many a would-be cabbie is failed and told to go back "on the knowledge" for two or three months before applying to be examined again. This system ensures that unless you happen to be drunk in the West End after midnight and get picked up by one of the sharks, you will be driven where you want to go by the most direct route possible.

Because of the severity of the testing, a very large proportion of Coloured Immigrants who have applied for licences haven't been able to pass the test. This they — and the ethno-masochists of the Race Industry — have put down to racial prejudice on the part of the examiners, and not to their own inability to meet the required standard.

If now the examiners are to be instructed to see to it that the entry rate of Coloured Immigrants into the trade is

speeded up it can only mean that examination standards will be dropped either just in the case of Immigrants or in the case of all applicants, regardless of colour. Either way, the general public and established cabbies who wish to defend the standards of their professions, will suffer.

The rumour concerning how this development came about is interesting. For some while now the cabbies have been campaigning to persuade Parliament to outlaw the operations of the mini-cabs. Apart from being a threat to the livelihoods of the licensed cabbies, mini-cab firms have sometimes been shown to be run by shady characters, their drivers have no qualifications other than a driving license and are often tired as many of them maintain two jobs, and their cabs are often inadequately insured.

Up until recently Parliament was reluctant to legislate against the mini-cabs because ordinary cabbies tend not to operate very much (particularly at night) in Immigrant-inundated areas nor to pick up coloured passengers for fear of fare-dodging and mugging. On the other hand, mini-cab companies do tend to operate in Immigrant areas. Legislators were afraid that if they mini-cab companies disappeared the Immigrant community would be disadvantaged.

Frantic to get rid of the mini-cabs at all costs, the cabbies' lobbyists were able to do a bit of horse-trading in regard to assistance for would-be Immigrant cabbies. For good measure, the lobbyists canvassed the false notion that a very good reason for getting rid of the mini-cabs was that a number of mini-cab companies contributed generous sums to the National Front!

As a result of this horse-trading, it is believed that legislation will be introduced before the House of Commons before long which will severely restrict the ability of the mini-cabs to operate.

Casting the second and subsequent Stones

As I was preparing my 'copy' for this issue of *Spearhead* I started to hear news of a Crawley National Front branch demonstration against a meeting in their town of the local branch of the Campaign for Homosexual Equality.

My information has it that the purpose of the demonstration was to oppose the proposal by the C.H.E. to distribute to local schools "information packs" about homosexuality. If this was the purpose of the demonstration, then the demonstration was held with good cause as in my view sex

education in schools should only be given by properly qualified persons acting in consultation with parents who should have the ultimate right of veto concerning the scope and content of such courses.

Having said that, I would also like to express an additional personal comment that I trust the demonstration did not spill over into an all-out orgy (if that is the right word!) of canting moralisation and self-righteous attitude striking.

While many members of the National Front (particularly its many devout Christians) have, and are entitled to have, strong views on questions pertaining to private morality, sexual conduct and the like, they should always be sure that when demonstrating on behalf of the NF they take up a line specifically encompassed by NF policy.

It should be remembered that at the last NF A.G.M. a resolution which in part opposed the decision to include unqualified opposition to abortion on the party's election address at the last General Election was carried. The majority of members at that meeting — in my view wisely — seemed to think that it was not the proper function of a political party, which must appeal to a wide cross-section of the population, to adopt official policies on questions pertaining to private morality.

The only other logical alternative to that attitude would be for the party to define "sin" and then for those who felt that they were free from all blemish to proceed to root out the unworthy: the boozers, for fornicators, the adulterers, the homosexuals, the gamblers, and so forth.

If that path were to be pursued I fancy the NF would become a very elite, but also very small party, utterly unrepresentative of the British people and consequently completely out of touch with them.

It may be true that "England is the Homeland of the Hypocrite", but with our country in the state that it is in, Nationalists have far too many really important things to do to leave time to illustrate that point.

Show the Flag

FLAGS, ROSETTES,
POLES ETC.

SEND STAMP FOR LIST

W. BROWN, 20 SUTTON WAY,
HESTON, MIDDX, TW5 0JA

SCHOOL CHAOS

Contd. from page 5

Many parents of ten and eleven year olds are greatly impressed with the ability of their children to paint abstract masterpieces, to manage the controls of tape recorders, and the like, but would prefer them by that age to have grasped the fundamentals of reading, writing and simple arithmetic.

One member of the Bullock committee — Mr. Stuart Froome, a Surrey junior school headmaster — expressed his misgivings concerning modern educational methods by issuing a minority report. He stated that he believed there had been a decline in standards of English due to “excessive zeal for creativity”, and that there should be examinations (a swear word in the progressive educationalists dictionary) for all pupils at the ages of seven, eleven and 15.

Mr. Froome's views were, of course, roundly condemned by the Communist controlled and Trotsky-ite infiltrated National Union of Teachers as being “reactionary”. The N.U.T. praised the main part of the report for its “sympathy, understanding and support from modern methods”.

Mention of Communist influence in our schools leads me away from the futile Bullock report to another problem which is causing an increasing amount of concern among patriotic and aware parents with children at secondary school:

SOCIAL STUDIES

That problem is, the systematic inculcation into the minds of schoolchildren of Communist and extreme Left Wing ideology and attitudes by Red teachers (of various denominations) through the medium of so-called “Social Studies” classes.

Social studies classes in themselves are not a bad thing. It is to be expected that older school children should learn about the various political, social and moral problems which will confront them. But teachers should not instruct pupils what their attitudes should be to the issues under consideration — they should merely explain what are the essential elements of the problem from all points of view.

In cases of particularly controversial issues, particularly where politics are involved, partisan views should only be expressed by invited speakers who should be given equal opportunity to advance their case, and who should then be subjected to cross-examination by the pupils, with the teacher acting as an impartial Chairman.

These elementary rules are sustained by some schools, but as more Marxist orientated teachers come into the educational system these rules apply in fewer and fewer cases.

Red fanatics are convinced that their views are “right”, that all other views must

HOW TO DEAL WITH RED TYRANTS

On Saturday 15th March a few members of Preston NF Branch — Mr. Eddy Harrison, with Paul and Michael Howarth and their 19 year old sister — were giving out leaflets in Preston High Street when they were set upon and beaten up by a large gang of International Socialists and International Marxists — many of these from Lancaster University.

The NF members had their bundles of leaflets snatched from them and they were punched and kicked. In the great tradition of Red thuggery, the brave Trots kept their special venom for a young girl. Miss Howarth was punched to the ground and kicked on the chin.

Pleased with their day's work the Reds walked off with their ringleader, an I.M.G. member shouting: “You will never ever be able to leaflet in Preston again!”

Mr. J. Kingsley Read, Chairman of the NF National Directorate who lives in nearby Blackburn, resolved with the Committee of Preston NF Branch that the time had come to teach the local Red louts a stern lesson.

Next Saturday Mr. Read, together

therefore be “wrong”, and that they have a duty to instil the “right” views into the minds of their pupils and a duty to suppress or deride “wrong” views.

A classic example of this kind of brainwashing was drawn to my attention recently by a National Front member whose son is a fourth year pupil at a comprehensive school in Wolverhampton. He gave me the notes for the Social Studies class on Apartheid in South Africa and Immigration in Britain. (The notes on Apartheid look to me like an extract from the “school kit” on the subject distributed by the Communist dominated Anti-Apartheid Movement).

Here are some quotes:

“In theory apartheid means keeping the two colours apart. In practise it means treating the black man as an inferior being . . . before 1948 it was a necessary evil that was tolerated; after 1948 the white man practised apartheid to survive and preserve privileges (a sentence of death on Bantus?) . . . Sharpsville Massacre: peaceful demonstration turned into slaughter of Africans . . . All African political parties are banned — even peaceful ones like the African National Congress . . . 1962 death penalty reintroduced for any act of opposition to the Government . . . South Africa is a dictatorship . . . Conclusion: If equal opportunity not given to majority through peaceful means then violence may be the only possible alternative.”

Some of those statements are half-truths, the rest are downright lies. In addition to this, no mention whatsoever is made of political and social conditions prevailing elsewhere in Africa.

Quotes from the paper on Coloured

with the same plucky youngsters who had been leafletting the previous week took up position in the same place and begin to give out their leaflets.

“Ho ho!”, thought the Red gang as they charged into what they thought was going to be another easy smash-up. They should have looked before they leaped, however, for as they moved in, a large number of tough Preston members who had hidden themselves moved in behind them and gave the cowardly Reds (who still had the numerical advantage) the thrashing of their lives.

A specially good pounding and kicking was given to the I.M.G. organiser and he had to be carted off to hospital for treatment.

Opponents of the National Front have nothing to fear from the NF providing they go about their activities lawfully. But if any persons try to deny to the NF the freedom to engage in legitimate political activity by means of physical violence, then they will be given the opportunity to reconsider their tactics in the nearest local hospital casualty ward.

Immigration are as follows:

“There is no pure Britain . . . recent major immigrant groups: the Irish . . . the Jews, fled from Europe, Russia and later Germany (Hitler) . . . Poles, Czechs, Germans, Mid-Europeans — fleeing from Fascism and poverty . . . Total estimated West Indian, Indian and Pakistani population in 1971 1½ to 2 million (2½% of the total British population) . . . West Indians come to settle, Indians and Pakistanis more likely to return . . . Conclusions: Facts show we need not fear the size of influx (we won't be overrun) . . .”

PARENTS' DUTY

Again another politically-motivated concoction of half-truths and sheer lies. If this is the kind of stuff that our children are being fed on Apartheid and Coloured Immigration, God or Marx knows what they will be expected to absorb when such subjects as patriotism, family life, the Cold War and other themes come up.

Wolverhampton NF Branch will be taking action in the near future to oppose Red brainwashing in their local schools. Parents elsewhere should be on their guard and should get details of other examples of subversion in schools to their local NF Branch and to the NF Head Office.

It is as important for NF members who are parents to be active members of their childrens' school Parent Teacher Association as it is for working NF members to be active members of a trade union. The multi-racialists and the Communists have made the schools just as much a spring-board for subversion as the factories.

Another council bows to red violence

Yet another Labour controlled Council has bowed to threats of violence from extreme Left Wing organisations and has cancelled an NF meeting. A recent issue of *Front Page*, the bulletin of Islington NF Branch reports:

“As announced in our last newsletter, the Islington Branch of the National Front booked Islington Town Hall for a massed rally against Britain’s continued membership of the E.E.C. for Tuesday 25th March.

Islington Council accepted our booking on certain conditions – to all of which we agreed. They then confirmed the booking in writing. One of the conditions was that we insure the Town Hall against possible damage. This we did to the tune of £25,000 with a major insurance company.

No sooner was the acceptance of our booking made public that the Red Chorus started its protest. Led by Mrs Marie Betteridge, veteran Communist poller of derisive votes in Islington, Kay Beauchamp, Communist secretary of the London Area Council of the Liberation organisation (whose protest rally in Red Lion Square ended with its supporters rioting against the Police); and a few Left-Wing Labour Councillors.

This fearsome league of Lefties, extremists and viragos so frightened the Council that they immediately cancelled the booking. The reasons the Council has given for its decision was “Likely public (sic) opposition to the holding of the meeting” and, in complete contradiction “because too many people would want to attend the meeting”!

This Council ban is not going to be

accepted by the Branch or the whole party lying down. The NF National Directorate has decided that the whole party must rally to support an outdoor rally and picket of protest at or near to the front of the Town Hall, Upper Street, Islington, on the evening when the NF’s indoor meeting was to have taken place – i.e. at 7.30 p.m. on Tuesday 25th March.

The theme of this protest will be Free Speech, and, as expected, various Red organisations have threatened to mobilise against it. But NF members will be there in large enough numbers to frustrate any attempt at intimidation.

As a footnote to this story, one of the Labour Councillors who voted for the NF to be allowed to use the hall, Mr. Henry Hodges, is Chairman of the National Council for Civil Liberties. He was so disgusted by his colleagues’ attitude to Free Speech that his organisation has expressed an interest in raising the whole issue of Council bans against the NF – not just in Islington, but everywhere, and has asked NF Head Office to provide particulars.

Local NF Organisers throughout the country are asked to provide full details, including photostats of press cutting and correspondence, of any Council bans they know of. The N.C.C.L. is already aware that the majority of Councils upholding bans on the NF are Labour controlled.

In this regard it is noteworthy that a recent issue of *Labour Weekly* (which numbers on its editorial staff at least one associate of the International Marxist Group) carried a statement by Mr. Reg Underhill, the National Agent for the Labour Party,

warning his party’s National Executive that in areas with rising unemployment and high Immigrant populations the Labour Party must actively campaign to combat “the prejudice and fear on which the NF thrives”.

The Islington ban is clearly just a part of a campaign by the Governing party in our land to use State and Municipal powers to deny an opposition party the right of assembly and free speech. That is a very dangerous path for any governing party to tread. The British people have a way of dealing with tyrants.

Local councillor joins NF

Worthing Borough Councillor Mr. Peter Mitton, who represents the Durrington Ward for the Worthing Ratepayers’ Association announced to the local press at the beginning of February that he had joined the National Front.

Cllr. Mitton declared that he had been a member of the NF for about seven or eight months. “I agree with the majority of their policies, especially that of law and order,” he said.

The question of Cllr. Mitton’s NF membership came up at a Council meeting recently by one of two other Ratepayer candidates who had recently decided to align with the Conservative group on the Council, and who had been called “turncoats” by other Ratepayers Councillors.

Cllr. Mitton commented: “Obviously Ratepayer councillors are going to have political views. It would be almost impossible to get councillors without political ties of some description. If they were not they would either be daft or would drift with the wind on every issue.”

He added that throughout the country there were Ratepayer Councillors of every political shade.

Read Britain First

Read *Britain First*, the new pro-National Front monthly. *Britain First* can be bought from your local branch at 5p. Copies can be obtained from National Front HQ office in bulk at the following prices:—

50 copies	£1.50 (plus 30p postage)
100 copies	£3.00 (plus 36p postage)
200 copies	£5.00 (plus 48p postage)
300 copies	£7.50 (plus 58p postage)
400 copies	£8.00 (plus 73p postage)
500 copies	£10.00 (plus £1.09 postage)

One of the best ways in which you can help the NF cause is to buy a bulk supply every month and distribute it in your area. Our office is not anxious to be tied down to the operation of sending out great numbers of single copies, but we will send single samples by return of post to anyone who writes to us enclosing 5p plus S.A.E. of at least foolscap size to facilitate quick and easy dispatch.

Write to: 50 Pawsons Road, Croydon, CRO 2QF.

NF

puts
Britain
First

The National Front is Britain’s fastest-growing party which says: “Put Britain and the British people first!”. It is the true voice of the British people. Its main policies have been proved by one opinion poll after another to represent the views of the great majority of the British people. Find out more about the National Front by completing this form and sending it to:
The Secretary, National Front, 50 Pawsons Road, Croydon CRO 2QF, Surrey. (Tel. 01-684 3730)

Name

Address

.....

.....

The National Front needs money. It needs the funds to print leaflets, pamphlets and posters, to fight elections, to mount demonstrations, to organise the biggest patriotic movement in Britain.

So invest in your country’s future. Send a donation to the National Front Fighting Fund today. It will be money well spent.

THE NATIONAL FRONT at the moment is rather like the skinny weakling who has suddenly found the weightlifting course actually worked, and is wondering what to do with his new found strength.

The following proposals and suggestions are a "nuts and bolts" omnibus package of how your group or branch can best exploit our now potent, national image to advantage, the nitty gritty of necessary organisational procedure that for the time being should augment our endless outpourings of ideology and propaganda. After all in many cases we are preaching to the already converted anyway, and it is possible to bore a captive audience to death!

I submit the most productive way to encourage our future growth and income is for every branch to embark **now** on a crash programme of opening combined licensed social clubs/bookshop/headquarters in every town possible; the opportunities will never be better. They will never be better because every high street in this country is now accumulating row upon row of empty and non-productive shop accommodation, the landlord's main concern is as always to ensure that he gets at least some income from his investment, and that is where our new found bargaining power comes in.

Associations such as ours are the only source now capable of guaranteeing a landlord's rent. We can do this by collective action where each member pledges sums of say 25p upwards per week for say a period of one year. It does not take a very large branch to pledge say £18 to £30 per week for one year and this kind of money would rent what to me would be the ideal type of HQ, namely a building on a main shopping street or entrance road to a town (so you get in effect a free advertising site as well, via the passing traffic) — a bookshop and office on the ground floor, invaluable for recruiting passers-by, a social club on the first floor (or basement), in itself a recruiting medium. The fruit machine takings usually pay the rent: the floors above could be let at discount rentals as accommodation for local members, who would also provide on the premises security, and another part could be set aside as dormitory accommodation for visiting members. The whole package could be self supporting very quickly indeed.

Members who pledge this first year's rent could be repaid with say five year memberships of the social club and other privileges that acknowledge the fact that they have been the ones with the foresight and guts that have made the new HQ possible. Perhaps a brass engraved scroll of honour could be put up inside the clubroom. We all like some credit for our efforts after all!

Now how about general branch funds? Have you held your jumble sale yet, or, if you have held it, have you booked the hall for the next one? Ideally these should be held every three months. How about your salvage drive? The price of waste paper recently went through the roof and some people made

ROGER MAITLAND

SOME IDEAS FOR BRANCHES

small fortunes by hiring lorries and collecting it *en masse*. The price has dropped now but something will be next — lead, copper? Be ready in any case and collect scrap that is fetching money in the meantime.

Have you booked that hotel or pub room for your next social yet? Again these should be held at regular intervals, with the venues, ideally, getting better and better. Why not book a hotel in the best part of town and combine this evening with your introductory night for new members? The best way to introduce new members to a branch is over a few drinks in luxurious surroundings. Nothing could be more off-putting for a prospective new member than attendance at a branch meeting in a tatty back room in a pub. They must feel rather like new boys at a slum school, sitting on a hard wooden chair whilst the chairman and committee lecture them from behind a desk. This system is almost guaranteed to alienate new members before they start. The NF image we want is that of prosperity and success. So when new members are being introduced don't turn up in something threadbare. Success breeds success. Be positive, confident and slightly aggressive where necessary. Sometimes I think we have ourselves swallowed so much enemy propaganda that it has affected our own confidence. Think NF, think success and we will be a success. This is the most elementary lesson in psychology and is the first lesson taught in Madison Avenue.

Everything mentioned so far must lead to the inevitable question of just how efficient is your branch? Have you noticed a dropping off in attendance lately? Do you have a job keeping awake at the monthly branch meetings?

The following methods are used, and used successfully in many other organisations and associations. Select whichever suits your situation:

Reserve fifteen minutes at the end of each meeting for a "chairman for the night" and let any member who feels he can improve his branch's efficiency have his or her say **from behind the chairman's desk**. To have to stand up in a hall and put your views from the hall can often be inhibiting, and this method encourages **participation**, which is what all political movements are, or should be, about.

Have you made tentative long term arrangements for your next council elections? In particular have you produced a **town plan** for your area? Now is the time. Find out what the important local issues are and detail

your proposals **now**.

Have you a carnival summer procession in your town similar to that held by Brighton *Lions* in aid of charity? Have you arranged your float or lorry hire yet? It will be hard for the local authorities to refuse us **now** — why not a float depicting typical British men and women, Pearly Kings, miners, soldiers, people in regional dress etc.?

Has every member of your branch bought a flag yet? If not, why not?

Have you established a mutual lending library of political literature at your monthly branch meetings yet? After all, many members would balk at the buying price of *Dispossessed Majority* for example.

Have you made arrangements for the printing of your own Christmas cards and diaries? Perhaps a large national order could be placed now.

Are you cultivating the most promising prospective new members in your town? How about the class that is currently suffering more than any at the hands of both parties: the small businessman or self employed person, the small landlord who used to let a spare room or two before the rent act? Why not a blitz of our new small businessman leaflet on these people, ruined by the Labour Party and abandoned by their traditional masters, the Conservatives?

Do you insert regular recruiting advertisements in your local paper? Many of our present members did not know we existed until actually reading one of these. The NF must be made more **accessible**. In some towns you could not find us with a search warrant and compass!

How about a mutual system of holiday flat exchanges between members (if say central London member has a small flat or rooms suitable for two adults on occasional weekends please contact me via *Britain First* — I have similar under-occupied accommodation in Brighton).

Have you vetted **and complained** about the left-wing slant of your children's school-books, particularly the "Religious education" ones? Have you written at least one letter a month to the readers' letters column of your local newspaper?

Why shouldn't the next A.G.M. be held in Brighton as a contrast to the dreary charade of the Con and Lab gatherings? Hotels here are open to any offer these days.

If any of my suggestions turns you on, please do contact me with your reactions, suggested modifications, etc. Remember, don't just make conversation about our movement — **do something!**